Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/666,778	GOOSSENS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
RUSSELL KALLIS	1638	

	RUSSELL KALLIS	1638	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 Al The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following r application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (t	Ivisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of set under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the si set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b 	ut prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).			
7. Me for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 15.20 and 21. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.113.16.19 and 22.24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		i be entered and an e	xpianation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 		condition for allowan	ce because:
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (I Other: 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Russell Kallis/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U January 30, 2009	nit 1638	

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' amendment and arguments thereof directed toward the definition of the term production in the specification have not been persuasive becusae the specification defines production as an increased level of detction in the vacuole for example on page 18 paragraph 0043 lines 5-7. Moreover, Applicants' arguments stating that secretion and production are separate processes fails to acknowledge that the specification has embraced coextensive definitions:

from pagragra[h 0032; An "enhanced secretion" does not necessarily mean that there is a higher production, it can also mean that there exists the same level of production but that the secretion is enhanced.

from paragraph 0043; "In yet another embodiement, the same production of at least one secondary metabolite occurs in the transformed plant but an enhanced secretion of at least one secondary metabolite occurs by the transformed plant. Secondary metabolites can for example be efficiently produced by continuous secretion from the roots of hydroponically grown plants. This process of secretion is also been termed "hizosecretion".

Given the place in prosecution and entrance of the amendment and Applicants' prior notice of appeal it is noted that this issue may necessitate a new grounds of rejection in Examiner's response to the appeal under 11/2 1st paragraph enablement directed to the issue at hand that the specification does not provide sufficient guidance for those ABC transporters that would only enhance secretion as opposed to those that would enhance production and secretion.

In response to Applicants' assertion over Theodoulou, Applicants' remarks are largely duplicative of those previously filed. Nonetheless, in response to Applicants assert that the references do not teach the exact function of the ABC transporter APGP1 and thus the claim limitation is not taught in the prior art. However, the claims are not drawn to any specific or exact activity of Punction other than the broadly claimed transport of an unspecified secondary metabolite. In addition, the method does not require knowledge of the exact function or metabolite specificity, but rether is permissive for the discovery of that activity during the selection step and therefore obvious

Further, AtPGP 1 is listed as an embodiment of the invention;

"An MDR-like gene (atogo 1) has also been identified in A. thaliana, which encodes a putative P-glycoprotein homolog. This atogo 1 gene was found to share significant sequence homology and structural organization with human MDR genes. Other MDR homologues have been found in potato and barley. Genes encoding ABC-transporters of the present invention which may be operably linked with a promoter for expression in a plant species may be derived from a chromosomal gene, cDNA, a synthetic gene, or combinations thereof."; and thus contrary to Applicant's assertions one of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation of success.